



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Am

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/625,481	07/21/2003	Terrence Blevins	06005/39533	9135

4743 7590 05/11/2005

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 6300
SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

BARNES, CRYSTAL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2121

DATE MAILED: 05/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/625,481

Applicant(s)

BLEVINS ET AL.

Examiner

Crystal J. Barnes

Art Unit

2121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 11, 14-16, 20-24, 31-38, 40 and 45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-10, 12, 13, 17-19, 25-30, 39 and 41-44 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 July 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>27 May 2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is an initial Office Action upon examination of the above-identified application on the merits. Claims 1-45 are pending in this application.

Priority

2. Applicant has complied with the conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 120.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The examiner has considered the information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 27 May 2004.

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: reference number 120 in figure 4.

Art Unit: 2121

5. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: reference numbers 184 and 186 do not appear in figure 7B.

6. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1, 11, 15, 16, 20 and 31-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Pub. No. 2004/0078182 A1 to Nixon et al.

The applied reference has common inventors with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

As per claim 1, the Nixon et al. reference discloses a process control system element for use in a process plant having a user interface and one or more process controllers, the process control system element comprising: a control module (see page 3 [0026], "control modules") adapted to execute on the one or more process controllers ("controllers 12a, 14a, 16a") to implement process control activities ("process control loops") within the process plant ("process control system 10"); a graphic display module (see page 4 [0031], "information section 74") adapted to produce a graphical depiction ("graphical or textual description") of at least a portion ("node indication section") of the process plant ("process control system 10") on the user interface (see page 4 [0030], "control or simulation display screen 70"); and a process simulation module (see page 4 [0028], "simulation system or application 50") adapted to simulate the operation of one or more physical devices ("nodes") within the process plant ("process control system 10") being controlled by the control module ("control modules") and depicted in the graphical depiction ("graphical or textual description") associated with the graphic display module ("control or simulation display screen 70"), wherein the process simulation module ("simulation system or application 50") is communicatively connected (see page 4 [0029], "routine 57") to the control module ("control modules") to communicate

data between the process simulation module ("simulation system or application 50") and the control module ("control modules") during operation of the control module ("control modules").

As per claim 11, the Nixon et al. reference discloses the process simulation module ("simulation system or application 50") includes a simulation algorithm ("routine 57") adapted to simulate process dynamics (see page 3 [0026], "input function, control function, output function") within the process plant ("process control system 10").

As per claim 15, the Nixon et al. reference discloses the process simulation module ("simulation system or application 50") includes a first portion (see page 3 [0028], "distribute") stored in and adapted to be executed in a first computing device (see page 4 [0028], "workstation 20a") within the process plant ("process control system 10") and a second portion stored in ("distribute") and adapted to be executed in a second computing device (see page 3 [0026], "workstation 18a") within the process plant ("process control system 10").

As per claim 16, the Nixon et al. reference discloses the first portion ("workstation 20a") of the process simulation module ("simulation system or application 50") is communicatively connected (see page 3 [0025], "data highway

30") to the second portion ("workstation 18a") of the process simulation module ("simulation system or application 50") through an external reference (see page 3 [0026], "configuration database 32").

As per claim 20, the Nixon et al. reference discloses the control module ("control module") is adapted to receive a simulated measurement (see page 4 [0029], "simulation instances") from the process simulation module ("simulation system or application 50") and an actual measurement (see page 3 [0025], "data") from a device (see page 3 [0024], "input/output and field devices 22, 23, 24") within the process plant ("process control system 10").

As per claim 31, the Nixon et al. reference discloses the process simulation module ("simulation system or application 50") includes a plurality of interconnected simulation elements (see page 4 [0028], "simulation instance"), wherein two or more of the simulation elements ("simulation instance") simulate the operation of different devices ("control modules") within the process plant ("process control system 10").

As per claim 32, the Nixon et al. reference discloses the process simulation module ("simulation system or application 50") further includes a stream element (see page 3 [0026], "function blocks") that represents a material ("input, control,

output functions") within the process plant ("process control system 10"), wherein the stream element ("function blocks") is connected to one or more of the simulation elements ("simulation instance") within the process simulation module ("simulation system or application 50").

As per claim 33, the Nixon et al. reference discloses each of the simulation elements ("simulation instance") includes a simulation algorithm (see page 4 [0028], "simulation modules") that models the operation of an associated device ("control modules") within the process plant ("process control system 10").

As per claim 34, the Nixon et al. reference discloses the simulation algorithm ("simulation modules") for one of the simulation elements ("simulation instance") is selectable as one of a number of predefined algorithms ("each simulation modules").

As per claim 35, the Nixon et al. reference discloses further including a library (see page 3 [0025], "database 32") of predefined simulation algorithms ("simulation modules") for use in the one of the simulation elements ("simulation instance").

As per claim 36, the Nixon et al. reference discloses the simulation algorithm ("simulation modules") for one of the simulation elements ("simulation instance") is user definable (see page 4 [0029], "creating").

As per claim 37, the Nixon et al. reference discloses further including a graphic editor (see page 4 [0029], "display routine 56") adapted to assist a user in defining the simulation algorithm ("simulation modules") for the one of the simulation elements ("simulation instance").

As per claim 38, the Nixon et al. reference discloses further including a high fidelity simulation (see page 4 [0029], "routine 57") having portions thereof communicatively connected to the simulation elements ("simulation instance") of the process simulation module ("simulation system or application 50") to provide high fidelity simulation parameters ("reference parameter modules") to the simulation elements ("simulation instance").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been

Art Unit: 2121

obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pub. No. 2004/0078182 A1 to Nixon et al. in view of USPN 6,161,051 to Hafemann et al.

As per claim 14, the Nixon et al. reference discloses the graphic display module ("control or simulation display screen 70") is communicatively coupled (see page 4 [0029], "routine 57") to the process simulation module ("simulation system or application 50") to receive one or more simulated parameters ("inputs or outputs") from the process simulation module ("simulation system or application 50") and wherein the graphic display module ("control or simulation display screen 70") is adapted to produce an animation within the graphical depiction ("graphical or textual description") based on the one or more simulated parameters (see page 3 [0026], "input, control output functions").

The Nixon et al. reference does not expressly disclose an animation within the graphical depiction.

The Hafemann et al. reference discloses

(see column 14 lines 51-65, "The enterprise wide control system ... animate simulation and subsequent production displays with a graphical depiction at various levels of hierarchical detail ...")

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the simulation system/application taught by the Nixon et al. reference with the code taught by the Hafemann et al. reference to animate simulation.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the simulation system/application with the code to animate simulation so that the electrical, pneumatic, hydraulic, logic, diagnostics, external behavior, controlled resources and safety elements of a control system could be defined and illustrated.

11. Claims 21, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pub. No. 2004/0078182 A1 to Nixon et al. in view of USPN RE 30,280 to Berman et al.

As per claim 21, the Nixon et al. reference does not expressly disclose the control module is further adapted to use the simulated measurement from the

process simulation module to perform the control activities within the process plant.

The Berman et al. reference discloses

(see column 8 lines 12-29, "... process the incoming and control signals and to automatically send back the appropriate plant condition signals for simulating ... computer model of the plant ... defined in terms of the input and output signals seen by the control system equipment 24 ... all sensor outputs are modeled and action are taken for all control or actuating signals from the control system equipment 24.")

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the process control system taught by the Nixon et al. reference to include both the simulated data and actual data taught by the Berman et al. reference.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the process control system to include both the simulated data and actual data for maximum efficiency and flexibility.

As per claim 23, the rejection of claim 21 is incorporated and further claim 23 contains limitations recited in claim 21; therefore claim 23 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 21.

As per claim 24, the rejection of claim 21 is incorporated and further claim 24 contains limitations recited in claim 21; therefore claim 24 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 21.

12. Claims 40 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pub. No. 2004/0078182 A1 to Nixon et al. in view of USPN 5,826,060 to Santoline et al.

As per claim 40, the Nixon et al. reference does not expressly disclose the process simulation module is adapted to produce a simulated parameter indicative of an operation of the process plant and to generate an alarm for display to a user based on the value of the simulated parameter.

The Santoline et al. reference discloses

(see column 7 lines 48-53, "the stimulated system incorporates the actual plant to man-machine interface (windows, process diagram displays, alarm lists, system diagnostics and so forth) ...")

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the simulation system/application taught by the Nixon et al. reference with the interface taught by the Santoline et al. reference to present in the simulator any problems inherent in the actual system.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the simulation system/application with the interface to present in the simulator any problems inherent in the actual system, thereby leading to earlier detection/diagnosis.

As per claim 45, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated and further claim 45 contains limitations recited in claim 40; therefore claim 45 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 40.

Allowable Subject Matter

13. Claims 2-10, 12, 13, 17-19, 25-30, 39 and 41-44 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following references are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to simulating process control in general:

USPN 5,347,446 to Iino et al.

US Pub. No. 2005/0096872 A1 to Blevins et al.

JPPN 1-298389 A to MOCHIIJI

JPPN 1-120593 A to SONODA

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Crystal J. Barnes whose telephone number is 571.272.3679. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday alternate Mondays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Knight can be reached on 571.272.3687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



CJB

9 May 2005